







# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/435,570	11/08/1999	JAMES M. KUBIK 591-99-023		5395	
24024 75	24024 7590 11/19/2003		EXAMI	EXAMINER	
CALFEE HALTER & GRISWOLD, LLP 800 SUPERIOR AVENUE SUITE 1400 CLEVELAND, OH 44114			WALTON, G	WALTON, GEORGE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3753	11/	
			DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003	17	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

P)		141				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	09/435,570	KUBIK ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
TI MAN NO DATE (4)	George L. Walton	3753				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Fe	ebruary 2002.					
2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☒ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6-11</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-5</u> is/are rejected.	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-5</u> is/are rejected.					
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
12)						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/435,570

Art Unit: 3753

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-5 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lippiatt. The interference fit is obvious in view of the valve member second portion (the non-referenced member that the spring 39 upper end engages) that sealingly engages the bore within the first valve member portion 26. Element 33 is readable on the check valve member, element 39 is readable on the biasing member and the follower is the lower end of the second member and the lower shoulder portion of the check valve 33.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lippiatt, as applied in the above rejection of claim 1, further in view of Oberthur. The above claims are readable on the patent to Lippiatt with the single exception of having a brake type valve member made out of non-metallic material. The patent to Oberthur teaches the above exception. In view of the teaching of Oberthur, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to make the valve member of Lippiatt out of elastomeric or non-metallic material as taught by elements 204-206, if desired. Claim 5 is a matter of design choice in view of the teaching of Lippiatt. Such teaching provides no unobvious or unexpected result.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 6-11 are allowed

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George L. Walton whose telephone number is 703-308-2596. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, between the hours of 8:00 am and 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Scherbel can be reached on 703-308-1272. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7765.

Art Unit: 3753

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0861.

George L. Walton
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753